

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
AUTHORITY MEETING**

Minutes of Township Authority Meeting held August 26, 2014

The regular meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Authority was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chairman William C. Seeds, Sr., on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Authority members present in addition to Mr. Seeds were: William B. Hawk, William L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman, David Blain, Robin Lindsey and Justin Eby. Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Authority Solicitor; William Weaver, Lower Paxton Township Authority Director; Mark Wilson, Engineer, Jim Wetzel, Operations Manager; Kevin Shannon, Alton Whittle and Mitchell Collins, GHD; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mrs. Lindsey led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Hawk made a motion to approve the July 1, 2014 Authority meeting minutes. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Public Comment

Eric Epstein, 4100 Hillsdale Road, noted that he was present to raise some concerns on behalf of the Stray Winds Area Neighbors (SWAN) in regards to discussion held several months ago that Triple Crown Corporation proposed to send gray water to the golf course from the Stray Winds Farm during peak flows. He noted that he has not heard from Mark or John DiSanto on this proposal but he wanted to register that he would like to work on that project if it does come to fruition. He explained that he was told that it was in a very preliminary stage but SWAN is tracking it. He noted that the Authority is looking to revisit a pump station on the Stray Winds Farm property that is contiguous with the Kunkle property and he wanted to register a concern with that. He noted that it has been a concern of SWAN's for a number of years. He noted that

these are the two concerns that SWAN has; not necessary in opposition to the gray water proposal as it seems that it could make sense. He noted that some members are nervous about a pump station on Stray Winds Farm or the property that runs along Paxton Church Road.

Mr. Hornung questioned where that project stands. Mr. Weaver answered that as part of the engineer's report, Mr. Shannon will be able to update the Board on that. He noted that the Board suggested that he should meet with Triple Crown Corporation, the City of Harrisburg, and Susquehanna Township to look at storage needs that the Authority will have in the future. He noted that Mr. Wendle has indicated that the Authority has enough capacity for existing development; however, to accommodate future development, the Authority will need to have storage someday. He noted that all three options were put on the table and the Triple Crown option is the least favorable due to the cost; Susquehanna Township looks to be the least expensive and the City of Harrisburg Authority is in a very preliminary stage as they just met for the first time.

Mr. Seeds noted that it is on the agenda to discuss later in the meeting. He noted if and when those talks will occur if any negotiations will take place that will involve SWAN, staff would let Mr. Epstein know. Mr. Epstein noted that it was not so much as locating facilities on Stray Winds Farm but that the Kunkle's are vigorously opposed to losing anymore land. He noted that they did donate and lost a great deal of land when I-81 was build and he can't speak for the Snyder Family as they have a big chunk of land on Paxton Church Road but the best thing is to meet and discuss to determine where it is going and what the options are. He noted that we did this a few years ago when the Authority bought some land in Susquehanna Township that did not work out for this particular project.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Epstein will be notified when this occurs in regards to any discussion with Triple Crown Corporation.

Mr. Seeds thanked Mr. Epstein and the Central Dauphin High School Board for its cooperation with the parking of the buses on Hidden Lake Drive. Mr. Epstein noted that the following day Mr. Thompson closed out that issue. He suggested if there are any issues in the future to please contact the School to see what it can do to fix it. Mr. Seeds noted that it was a

good example of cooperation between the Township and the School District in helping to solve problems.

Board Members' Comment

No comments were provided.

New Business

Review of the Draft 2015 Authority Budget

Mr. Weaver noted that he will cover the budget narrative, the Engineer's budget, status of the \$42 million remaining bond funds, and status of the new bond issue that shows the projects slated for the \$25 million.

Mr. Weaver noted that this is a preliminary draft budget review. He noted that he would point out the items that have changed from the previous year budget and skip over the items that remain unchanged.

Mr. Weaver noted that the current rental funds projected for 2015 is \$12,200,000 based upon maintaining the rates at \$125 a quarter. He noted that Mr. Wendle provided last year a five-year projection after the Board requested a different rate structure. He noted that based upon that he is showing a rate of \$125 per quarter. He noted that Mr. Wendle will provide more of an update during the November meeting. He explained that he reduced the number of EDUs as he has seen a decrease in sewer revenues, probably due to the economy. He noted that there is still a good deal of office space that is vacant. He noted that he projected \$12.5 million for 2014 and it looks like it will come in at \$12.2 million, the same amount that the Authority has finished at for the past three years.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Authority is doing a lot to go after people who are not paying their bills, but will it be shown in the amount. He suggested that the Authority is gaining in that area as far as reducing the backlog of Accounts Receivable. Mr. Weaver answered that we have an agenda item this evening under Township Reports to go over the delinquent accounts. He noted that it is a cash budget so it does not project delinquencies. He noted that he can do that but this is based on collecting all the EDU's and upon prior history of sewer rental collection. He noted that is what he is expecting based on historical use, noting that for the last three years the Authority experienced a 6% delinquency rate. He noted when the auditor looks at the

delinquencies, they are adjusted and not written off. He noted that they will be accounted for in the audit, but since the Authority is on a cash basis, the \$12.2 million is it, but we could see more if more is collected next year.

Mr. Hornung noted that there would be a reduction back to the 2009 levels of delinquency, so if that is true, would we not gain on cash flow by reducing the delinquencies as we are collecting more. Mr. Weaver noted that the end balance would be in the Modern Recovery Report. Mr. Hornung questioned how much is gained. Mr. Weaver answered that it is partially true that delinquencies continue to go up and using Modern Recovery has helped the Authority not to increase the delinquent amount. He noted that hiring Modern Recovery at the right time has assisted in collecting a lot of delinquent dollars; noting that the curve was really starting to go up. He noted that we were at 4% to 5%, but when the downturn in the economy occurred it rose to 6% or 7% and now we are starting to get back to 5%. He noted that it is difficult to put a number on it. He noted that we have only used their services for a year and it is too early to tell how effective it will be.

Mr. Hornung noted that there are vacancies and that is why the rate is going down. Mr. Weaver noted that we have vacant residential properties which adds towards the delinquencies because they don't pay as they abandon the property or it goes into foreclosure. He noted that commercial accounts are based on water usage so if you have a lot of offices that are vacant then you don't get the water flow that you typically get. He noted that he has not researched it to that degree but he is providing an educated guess. He noted that the budget is based on the past three-year history.

Mr. Seeds noted that the budget lists that it is a new rate of \$125, but it was that rate in 2014. Mr. Weaver noted that he will make that correction. Mr. Seeds noted that you are proposing that the rate remain the same.

Mr. Weaver noted under the tapping fees, he used the 2014 permit fees.

Mr. Seeds noted that due to the economy you are only projecting \$12,200,000 for sewer rentals but even though rental office space is down they would continue to pay the sewer rent. Mr. Weaver answered that is correct, as they pay a flat fee but not the increase that is based upon water flow. He noted if you have an office with 120 employees and you are using a lot of water there would be higher fees based upon metered water flows.

Mr. Weaver noted that the tapping fees, interest income, and PLGIT Arm interest income is unchanged although he added a new line item for reimbursements from the City of Harrisburg settlement at \$556,800. He noted that the Township has settled with the City of Harrisburg and the payment plan stretches out to 2018 with 37.12% being the Township's share of the payment. He noted that the total Authority revenue for 2015 is projected to be \$13,947,800.

Mr. Weaver noted that the management reimbursement includes the amount from last year as he has not had time to meet with Finance to determine the final number. He suggested that it is 5% to 10% lower at this time. He noted that office expense, computer costs, Audit fees, DEP Fines and engineering services are all unchanged with the exception of computer costs. He explained that he had a slight decrease as they are leasing seven computers but the other costs have remained stable as he is not purchasing computers anymore. He noted that the initial budget amount will decrease since we are stretching the lease agreement with the Township on an annual basis.

Mr. Weaver noted that he added \$50,000 for the special counsel for the legal reimbursement from the City of Harrisburg to the legal services as he will be needed for two years. He noted that there is \$110,000 for the collection of delinquent accounts from Modern Recovery.

Mr. Weaver noted that there are no other changes under expenses for administration and he is currently meeting with the insurance agent and have filed the renewal application. He noted for Operations the only change is that the uniform service has decreased slightly. He noted as a result of competition Mr. Wetzel may be able to reduce these costs. He explained that once he gets all three quotes he will make a recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Weaver noted that the purchase of major equipment is to replace existing fleet vehicles. He noted that it allows for the purchase of two pickup trucks and a trailer for the I&I crew.

Mr. Hornung questioned what fines have we paid for this year. Mr. Weaver suggested that we have paid \$17,500. He noted that the Authority had one extreme event. Mr. Weaver noted that \$17,500 was the amount provided for the CEP project, and Mr. Robbins is going to do a stream project in Spring Creek near Dowhower Road. He noted that the funds will be put to good use.

Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Weaver stated that he was purchasing two trucks, and he questioned if he has considered leasing the vehicles. Mr. Weaver noted that staff has gotten a lot of use out of the trucks and never priced out leasing but he could do that. Mr. Blain questioned what if he would look into financing the trucks over a three-year period. Mr. Weaver noted that the trucks are bought through the COSTAR's program and we get good pricing and the bodies hold up as staff puts liners in the truck beds so they will hold up longer. He noted that they have replaced some the engines since the bodies were in such good shape. He noted that they replaced two engines a few years back. Mr. Blain noted if you finance the vehicles you could get interest rates that are relatively low and suggested that Mr. Weaver should consider doing that instead of paying cash outright to buy a truck. Mr. Weaver noted that he would look into that and provide information at the next meeting. Mr. Blain noted that you could still keep the trucks for as long as you want to keep them.

Mr. Weaver questioned Mr. Wetzel if he has ever seen leases on the COSTAR program. Mr. Wetzel answered that he purchased the first backhoe that way through a three-year lease program so he believes that it could be possible. Mr. Blain noted that the budget has cash flow so if you are trying to generate additional cash flow for other projects that you may want to do during the year you may be able to find some cash in the major equipment purchases to move to something else. Mr. Seeds noted that other department have been going to leasing vehicles over the past few years.

Mr. Weaver noted under the Operations, electric-pump stations, sewer maintenance costs and PennDOT expenses are unchanged. He noted that he has a utility meeting scheduled tomorrow with PennDOT in regards to the I-83 expansion project. He suggested that the project will cause minor adjustments to the sewer facilities. Mr. Seeds questioned, in the past, the Authority has done some core drilling under the highway for sewage lines, and he questioned if there may be some opportunities for the Authority during construction to make some improvements at a lesser cost. He suggested that Mr. Weaver needs to speak to PennDOT about that. Mr. Weaver noted that he would refer to GHD to make any recommendations to the Board for those projects. He noted if it is a PennDOT project or a Township paving project he will make recommendation to replace the sewer depending on the conditions of the sewer after they are assessed. He noted that he would refer to GHD on that.

Mr. Seeds noted that in the past there were problems with trying to go under I-83 and there could be some opportunities. Mr. Weaver answered that we have two crossings, one at the Brooks Apartments and one at the Spring Valley Apartments. He noted that the initial review has not indicated a need to replace those lines but he will check into it.

Mr. Weaver noted for transmission, the Swatara Flow Surcharge is based on wet weather and it has been consistent. He noted the Swatara Transmission and Treatment is the cost per EDU that was provided for last year's budget since it is very preliminary and we have not received a budget from Swatara Authority yet. He noted for the first time in many years Swatara went over budget and that was due to the upgrade at the plant having issues with the dryer. He noted that Swatara is in litigation and the contract is still open from the expansion. He explained that he spoke to the Superintendent and was told that the dryer issue was going away. He noted that it has been repaired and is operating in good condition. He noted that Mr. Lank does not anticipate any increased cost at the facility.

Mr. Weaver noted for the City of Harrisburg, now known as the Capital Region Water (CRW), Mr. Wyland has been in negotiations with them on the rate structure following the expansion of their facility. He noted that Mr. Wendle has been assisting with that and there was a significant increase last year so this year Mr. Wendle is proposing a 1.7% increase. He noted that Mr. Wyland will be meeting with CRW over the next six months and he hopes to have a final budget number before then.

Mr. Crissman questioned how soon you expect a report on the negotiations. Mr. Weaver noted the CRW has been very busy with their expansion project and assessing their system. He noted that we have a rate that we are working with but he will remind Mr. Wyland that the Board is asking what the rate will be.

Mr. Weaver noted that the debt service information was provided by Susquehanna Financial Group. He noted that it includes the debt service for the 2015. He noted that he forgot to write in the number for 2015, it is \$1,048,172.

Mr. Hawk noted that we borrowed \$25 million for sewer work but we also have \$12 million still in flux that had to be spent by November. He questioned how we stand on these issues. Mr. Weaver noted that is attached as part of the budget noting that we had GHD track that along with the Finance Office and Susquehanna Financial Group. He explained that we have \$4.8 million left. He noted that special council stated that those funds had to be under

contract by November. Mr. Hawk questioned if we had to get an engineer's certificate to justify going over it in November. Mr. Weaver noted that we got that for the bond issue for the \$25 million. He noted that we will have all of the funds spent by November, noting that they are all under contract now and we are very close to spending it all. Mr. Seeds noted that is in the engineer's report. Mr. Weaver noted that the \$4.8 million that is remaining is already committed under the current contracts for Doli under BC6, JAO Bradley for PC 5, and Pact Construction for the Gale Drive work. He noted that four contractors are working on these projects to include Ronca and finishing those four projects will take up the remaining funds.

Mr. Weaver noted that the total debt service for 2015 is \$6,696,611. He noted that the net debt service when you subtract the \$854,000 subsidy payment as part of the 2009 bond issue reduced it to \$5,851,733 for 2015, and provides for total expenses of \$13,543,618.

Mr. Weaver noted that the capital projects contain the corrective action plan for Paxton and Beaver Creeks. He noted that the first two items are part of the Act 537 Improvements in the Paxton and Beaver Creeks. He noted that nothing is slotted for Paxton Creek in 2015 but Beaver Creek pump station controls are in the budget. He noted that they had a large wet weather pump that they were able to keep going for a while and staff delayed the bid to replace it this year since staff thought they could get some use out of it, however we had another issue with the control system so he has asked GHD to prioritize it again to get the controls in place. He noted that it is projected to be \$85,000 for 2015 for the close out for Truck G and Springford Village decommissioning. He noted that the total for this item is \$206,000. He noted that the remaining Department 37 accounts are still a break out of each mini-basin for design, metering, GIS Program. He noted that one large item would be Gale Drive at \$1,650,000 to complete the project in the spring of 2015. He noted the two big projects are PC-3A/B, where we are opening bids tomorrow, as it is a \$6 million job, noting that he has \$4,330,000 for this project and paving expenses of \$1,730,000. He noted that we have BC-4A projected at \$1,976,000, and these are the largest expenses for 2015. He noted that the subtotal for the I&I projects of \$11,205,500, providing a total fund of \$11,411,500.

Mr. Weaver noted that he provided the projects committed for the \$25 million that must be spent over the three years. He noted that \$11.4 million of the \$25 million has been committed.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Weaver was going over the GHD Budget. Mr. Weaver answered that he typically does not present that budget but would answer any questions the

Board may have on it. He noted that he has two inspectors that we are planning to use next year and he meets with Mr. Wendle and Mr. Shannon on an annual basis to get a better handle on that closer to November. He noted at one time they had four inspectors but he hopes to reduce it to two. He noted that their budget mainly concerns the design, engineering, permitting and inspections.

Mr. Seeds noted that it is pretty much unchanged. Mr. Weaver answered that no new accounts were added.

Mr. Blain questioned how long GHD has been with the Township. Mr. Shannon answered that it has been since 1999. Mr. Weaver noted that it has been 15 years. Mr. Blain questioned what the fees look like year after year. Mr. Weaver noted that they escalated a good bit in the last four years as we did a lot of planning in the first five to ten years with GHD on different proposals and alternatives for the Board to approve for Paxton, Beaver and Spring Creeks. He noted that once that was approved by the Boards and DEP they started to implement the plan and that raised the cost for design, permitting. He noted that much of the money is labor for inspections so generally speaking, not in terms of the percentage of their costs, but just in effort and workload to start the implementation of the CAP.

Mr. Shannon noted that he has been with GHD/CET since 2007 and he became involved in the project right after the 2007 decision which was to replace sewers in Paxton Creek. He noted from what he has seen, the billings have been consistent through that period with the replacement. He suggested for this year it was less on design, having more on the inspection side and with metering. He noted that there has been a shift in where the money is spent but the totals have been roughly the same.

Mr. Alton Whittle noted that he would be glad to put a presentation on that for the Board. Mr. Blain noted that when you have professional services that is over \$800,000 you have to ask the question.

Mr. Weaver noted that the service has been really good. Mr. Blain noted that he has no question about that as they are on top of the issues and know the facts. He noted that it is not a service related issue at all. He noted that it is \$800,000 and he wanted to know what it is like year after year. He stated that you have costs of living increases and payroll that you have to meet and internal rates that you have. He questioned if it has equated into a substantial increase in fees without the service; however, we are getting the service and the work done.

Mr. Weaver noted that they provided a new rate structure last year under the GHD platform. He noted that the Board viewed the transitional costs and he did not think it was very much.

Mr. Shannon noted that every year when GHD provides the amendments to the 1999 agreement at the February Board meeting there is a fee schedule attached. He noted that there were a couple of years after the collapse of the economy where GHD did not raise fees and held it from year to year. He noted that there is a normal increase for cost of living.

Mr. Blain noted that he is looking at Paxton Creek PC-4A, preliminary and final design permitting bidding at \$70,000. He questioned if that is what the fee will be on that project or what the budget is but based upon our hours and our hourly rate it could be higher or lower. Mr. Shannon answered the latter. Mr. Blain noted that it is not a fixed fee of \$70,000 to do that work. Mr. Shannon noted that most of the work is not a fixed fee, the retainer is, but most is determine by materials or costs, budget numbers that he works up with Mr. Weaver at this time every year.

Mr. Hornung noted that he remembered having a meeting with GHD, noting that \$800,000 is a lot of money and we delved into it to see where come of the costs were coming from and he felt comfortable after a while because they reviewed some areas where they are doing some pass through billing to accommodate the additional inspections. He noted that it made it more favorable for the Authority to use GHD than to hire the people as they used the people more efficiently and if our needs were down, the inspectors could be used somewhere else. He noted that we only paid for the time that we used the inspectors. He noted that he felt comfortable that they were doing well by us. Mr. Blain noted that he was just asking the question as he is not challenging anyone or saying that we needed to go out to bid. He noted it is nearly \$1 million worth of professional engineering services. Mr. Weaver noted that the costs will not go down for at least five or ten years. He noted that the schedule is very demanding to meet the consent order so you will see the fees for the next five to ten years.

Mr. Hornung questioned how much we are doing in projects in a year. Mr. Weaver answered that it is \$25 million for three years so it is about \$8.5 to \$9 million a year. He suggested that it would be pretty standard for the next 15 years. He noted that we are running about 10%. Mr. Weaver noted that design costs generally run about 5% to 6% and if you take the

inspections out, it gets you down to that. He noted that inspections are about \$400,000. Mr. Hornung suggested that it might be good idea to break it down.

Mr. Blain noted that GHD provides a rate schedule as well for hourly rates for staff level.

Resolutions 14-10-1 through 14-10-60 authorizing the condemnation of temporary and permanent easements in the BC4-A/B/C mini-basin

Mr. Weaver noted that Resolutions 14-10-01 through 14-10-60 are for the first 32 names on the list for the BC-4A/B/C project temporary construction easements. He noted that this must be done during the design phase to make sure we allow Mr. Stine adequate time to prepare condemnations if they don't sign the documents in the next 90-days. He noted that 32 are for private sewers and Resolution 33 through 60 are for the permanent and temporary sewer easements for the main sewer. He noted that it will allow Mr. Stine enough time to file condemnations for bidding this project which is slated for December 2014.

Mr. Seeds questioned what it means when he read potential easements. He questioned if there could be more as they are not names specifically for each resolution. He questioned how you handle that. Mr. Stine pointed out that it states that on the top of the page for the list of names. Mr. Weaver noted that it is an old list that was revised and the potential should have been changed to propose. He noted that initially when you are doing the preliminary design they are called potential easements and once the design is completed, it changes.

Mr. Weaver requested that the Board act favorable on these resolutions.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if someone does not sign off, what is the procedure. Mr. Weaver answered that they had 30 days to sign and then they get a 30-day certified letter; at this point it is turned over to Solicitor Stine. Mr. Stine noted that he does a current owner and lien search. He noted that they normally cost \$50 a piece as he needs to find out who owns the property and who all the lien holders are because when he does the declaration of taking along with the notice of condemnation, he has to serve the property and all the lien holders on record. He noted that he files that paperwork and if he doesn't get a response in 30-days from date of service then he will finalize it and it is done.

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve Resolutions 14-10-1 through 14-10-60 authorizing the condemnation of temporary and permanent easements in the BC4-A/B/C mini-basin. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Action on Sewer Billing for 5613 A. Akron Drive

Mr. Weaver provided the settlement sheet that was sent to Hershey Settlements as part of the settlement disclosure. He noted that staff first became aware of this when Hershey Settlement notified the Authority on August 13, 2014 that settlement was scheduled for August 21, 2014 for 5613 A. Akron Drive. He noted that staff determined that 5613 A Akron Drive was not being billed. He noted that Mr. Wetzel did a dye test to confirm that the property was connected to the sewer system but the records do not have a connection permit on file. He noted that the unbilled properties are discovered pretty quickly when you have a settlement. He noted that we have had a handful of these over the last 20 or 30 years but because this was one owner for the entire time for 43 years it was never discovered.

Mr. Weaver noted in talking with Solicitor Stine and Mr. Wolfe it was recommended to bring this to the Board and that the \$9,750 be collected as we are not aware of any extenuating circumstances. He explained that Sonia Cornfield is present representing the estate and she could answer any questions about what happened.

Ms. Sonia Cornfield explained that she is the daughter of Deborah Black. She noted that she lives at 2316 Wiser Way, Enola. She noted that her mom passed away about a year ago, and she was never billed for the sewer. She explained that she and her brother inherited the house and her brother was notified of this three days before settlement. She noted that funds were put in escrow and they were told that it would be discussed at the meeting today. She noted that she is present to represent the estate and to ask the board to consider a lower amount as \$10,000 is a large amount out of the estate and her mother would obviously like the money to go to her grandchildren.

Mr. Seeds questioned if she had settlement last week. Ms. Cornfield noted that they took the money and put it in an escrow account because they didn't want to stop the sale of the house. She noted that they would be willing to pay a portion of the bill, but it is a large amount of money and she would like the Board to consider a lower amount.

Mr. Blain questioned if there is a statute of limitations on this since it goes back to 1970. Mr. Stine noted that there is for taxes and utilities but just because someone doesn't get a bill doesn't mean that they don't owe the funds. He noted that the statute of limitations would not effect this at all.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how this could happen. Mr. Weaver noted that the procedure is that the applicant has to get a building permit and when it is issued they need to get a sewer permit at the same time. He noted that he could not tell what happened in 1972, but he assumed that that procedure was in place then. He noted that staff researched and found that a building permit was issued in 1972 but there is no record of a sewer permit which is not that extraordinary because some of the records for that time were spotty. He noted that the sewers were built and installed in the houses, but from that point forward we have pretty good records. He noted from staff level, we can't provide information for what could have occurred; if it was a billing error on our part, as that is not likely but it is possible. He noted that the plumber and the builder may have only gotten a building permit and possibly someone from staff never sent them over to get a sewer permit and they built the house and never got a sewer permit. He noted that having no permit for staff to initiate the billing, it could be missed. He noted that there was no audit of the sewer system done at that time, but now we are doing that. He noted that Mr. Whittle and his team as part of the GIS system are doing an audit for every mini-basin and when houses add up to being more than sewer accounts then we know we have a problem. He noted that we have caught that.

Ms. Lindsey questioned when they started to do that because obviously Ms. Cornfield's mother never paid a sewer bill. Mr. Weaver noted that this address is not in a sewer replacement basin; however, they recently found one in PC basin. Mr. Whittle noted when they do the basins now, they match up the current billing records with each property address to get the two to match.

Mr. Weaver explained that the latter years helped to raise the bill up to \$9,000.

Mr. Seeds questioned how Mr. Weaver calculated the bill. He noted that not too long ago, the rate was only \$45 a quarter. Mr. Weaver noted that the rate was \$16 in 1972. Mr. Seeds noted that you are not charging any interest. Mr. Weaver answered that there is no interest charged but the latter years added up quickly.

Mr. Seeds noted that there was a \$15 service charge, noting that it is a very small amount in compared to the total bill. Mr. Weaver explained that staff recommended we do that four or five years ago as they never had any administrative charge for settlements.

Mr. Seeds questioned what authority this Board has to reduce or dismiss the fees. Mr. Weaver noted unless there is some kind of litigation, staff can't make any recommendation other than collect the full amount unless the solicitor tells you otherwise.

Mr. Eby questioned if this has ever happened before to this extent. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Eby questioned what the course of action was. Mr. Weaver answered that there have been different circumstances and every case is different. He noted that staff would present it on the merits of the case as we had situations like this where we couldn't find any record or where we did not bill for whatever reason and the board entertained some concessions before if the property owner only owned the house for a brief period. He noted in the 18 years that he has worked for the Authority, it has happened seven or eight times. He noted that the Board has settled once or twice but for the most part we have collected the full amount. Mr. Blain questioned if there were seven or eight times where we went back to 1972. Mr. Weaver answered that this might be the first one that we went that far back, but we found some that were 30 or 40 years old.

Mr. Crissman questioned why this was not resolved at settlement between the buyer and the seller. Mr. Blain noted that it was as they put money in escrow to be able to turn the title of the house over. Mr. Crissman noted that it is usually resolved at the day of settlement with one absorbing the liability or they split it. Mr. Stine explained that the escrow is the way they resolved it. He noted that the seller had to take the cash out of the settlement and put it in an escrow account. Mr. Seeds noted that the buyer would have no responsibility for this. Mr. Blain noted that it is not uncommon that it happens that way.

Mr. Seeds questioned how much latitude the Board has. Mr. Stine suggested that the bond documents tell you that you have to collect all the sewer rents. Mr. Crissman noted that we are bound by the regulations.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if some of it is our fault that it wasn't collected. Mr. Crissman noted that it is very possible. Ms. Lindsey noted that 1972 is a long time ago and we never caught it. Mr. Weaver noted in the last few years we have started doing audits of the system as we found some so we knew they were out there and we made a plan to address unbilled accounts. He noted that going through the sewer replacement system is the best way to find these. Ms. Lindsey noted if Akron Drive does not get done in another five years and if there

wouldn't be a settlement it would be another five years that would have been added on to this, if the owner was still alive.

Mr. Stine noted if someone does not pay their bill, the fact of the matter is that it is the customer's responsibility to contact the utility to say that he hasn't received the bill. He noted that whether you get the bill or not, you are still responsible to pay the bill.

Mr. Hornung questioned what guarantee do we have that when the house was built that they tapped into the sewer at that point. He questioned if there were any other sewer facilities on property such as a septic system. Mr. Weaver explained that he assumed that the sewer was installed in 1970 and the house was constructed in 1972. Mr. Blain noted that his in-laws lived on Akron Drive and they built it in the late 1970's and according to what his father-in-law told him there was sewer at that time. Mr. Weaver noted that they had to assume that the house was connected right away.

Mr. Seeds noted that once the sewer is in the street a person would be required to hook up. Mr. Weaver noted that the Board could take action this evening or at another time. Mr. Seeds noted that the funds are being held in an escrow account until this is resolved. Mr. Blain noted that it is the estate's responsibility to pay it that is why the \$10,000 is in the account. He noted that he does not know how quickly they would have to pay it and if the Board determines that they have to pay it they would release the escrow to pay it.

Mr. Crissman noted that it is a liability against the estate. Mr. Blain noted that the estate can't be closed with the liability still outstanding in escrow.

Mr. Weaver noted that the solicitor recommend that the Authority prepared the settlement sheet for the full amount. He noted that he needs to send Hershey Settlement notice of the Board's decision and due to the large amount he did not feel comfortable making that determination.

Mr. Blain noted if it was an individual that was still alive and in the house and had title to it and they just didn't pay their bill for 40 years he would say that they need to pay the full amount. He noted that the individual has since past and they are trying to resolve the estate but he is not sure about making them go back 40 years to pay the sewer bill as it doesn't seem right. Mr. Crissman noted that it is the estate's responsibility to settle the debt representing the individual who is deceased, whether they are dead or alive, they are still representing the individual.

Mr. Eby noted whatever the Board does, it will set a precedent if this happens again. He questioned could future cases be handled on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Weaver noted that staff has presented the Board information and the Board makes its own decision. Mr. Blain noted that we have settled these on occasion and Mr. Weaver stated that we did settle with an amount that was different. Mr. Weaver noted that he would not recommend that you negotiate against yourself as you haven't received a proposal for what the settlement should be. He noted that he would recommend that you ask the estate to provide some type of settlement proposal if they want to act on something.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Board has had some instances but not for estates. He noted that they were regarding the sale of a property. Mr. Weaver noted that he could start to keep a list but he would have to ask staff if we have had ones like this. He noted that he would have to research this as he would be afraid to promise the Board that we had a history of what has happened in the last 20 years with settlements but he would recommend that the Board should receive a settlement offer from the trust before negotiating if the Board wishes to do that because there has been no proposal at this point.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the Board can ask the estate if they are willing to pay anything or are they asking not to pay anything at all. Mr. Blain noted that the estate is required to pay the full amount and that is why they have the \$10,000 sitting in escrow. He noted that Ms. Cornfield is asking if something can be negotiated lower and it goes back to what Mr. Weaver stated that Ms. Cornfield needs to get with her brother and come back with what they think might be a reasonable offer. He noted if that is what this Board wants to do. Mr. Seeds noting that Ms. Cornfield is appealing this to the Board but if we say no, there only recourse is Common Pleas Court. Mr. Blain suggested that they don't have a challenge to the court because you have an outstanding debt that needs to be paid. Mr. Crissman noted that it has to be paid by the estate. Mr. Blain noted that the only offer that they could have to the court is that the municipality for 40 years never billed us, but it doesn't matter as it is no different than the PPL bill. He noted that you are required to pay it whether you got the bill or not, especially if the bill is on a consistent basis. He noted if the bill is coming consistently you are required to make sure you pay it even if you don't receive it in the mail.

Mr. Seeds noted that he does not recall any like this and Mr. Eby is correct in that the Board would be setting a precedent. Mr. Hornung noted that it is not a matter of precedent,

noting that he remembers the one when we found out the person owed money, and they had only own the house for a couple of years... Mr. Stine noted that he previous owner had never paid the bill either. Mr. Hornung questioned what we did for that decision. Mr. Stine noted that he did not remember, but he did not think the Board made the current property owner pay the previous owner's bill, even though technically they would be liable for those bills since they bought it.

Mr. Seeds noted that there was one where the owner added more units. Mr. Weaver noted that is the case that you are talking about on Fritchey Street as the buyer bought the property and it was listed as a two unit but being billed for only one unit. Mr. Seeds noted that there was some relief provided to him.

Mr. Hornung noted that the farther you go back, 30 years, the cost was only \$16 a quarter. He noted that it is mostly the latter dates that add on the higher price to the bill.

Mr. Blain made a motion to table this matter until the next meeting to give the estate and the Authority staff time to come back with a potential settlement. Ms. Lindsey noted that the next meeting is not for three months. Mr. Blain noted that this concerns 40 years' worth of billing. Mr. Weaver noted that we will probably have a special meeting before November. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Blain wanted to make it the November meeting or some meeting in the future. Mr. Blain added to his motion, "at a point to be determined no later than the November 25th meeting."

Mr. Crissman questioned if the purpose for the motion is to allow Mr. Weaver and Ms. Cornfield and counsel to discuss what...; to propose an alternate amount. Mr. Blain answered that it is more for the estate to come back to the Board with what they would like to offer to us to pay the back sewer bills and then it would be up to the Board to make a decision. Mr. Crissman questioned if the estate or the representative of the estate, questioning if Ms. Cornfield is representing the estate. Ms. Cornfield answered that her brother is the executor. She noted that he lives three hours away. Mr. Crissman questioned Ms. Cornfield if it her brother's intent to propose an amount of money for consideration. Ms. Cornfield noted that it would be the intention to negotiate a lower amount although ideally they would only like to pay for the last year that they were taking care of the home since her mother died. Ms. Cornfield noted that she and her brother did not talk about an amount; she came to appeal to the Board to consider a lower amount, but she can talk to him about that. Mr. Crissman questioned what Ms. Cornfield's request is tonight. Ms. Cornfield answered to consider a negotiated amount, a lower amount. She

noted that she had done some research for what was done in other counties and it looks like it was a 35 year issue and they agreed to pay six years. She noted that she is not an expert in this situation and they only found out about this roughly a week ago. She noted that she did not come prepared for an offer for what to pay; she just thought that \$10,000 was a high amount to pay for something that they knew nothing about prior to this time.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it was proper to ask for an offer for what they are willing to give because we have a right to collect what was due. He noted that it is up to the Board to determine if it wants to exonerate any of the amount that is due.

Mr. Blain noted that is fine if that is what the Board wants to do. He noted that he stands by his motion thinking that going back 40 years to collect, noting that he understands the legality or the matter, but there is the reality of the matter. He noted that we are saying to the owner that you are responsible for calling about the bill and he agrees about that but we are also saying that our internal process in the Sewer Department is at question as we are not sure that we are billing everyone. He questioned whose responsibility is that. Mr. Seeds noted that we have some responsibility as well. He suggested that it be a 50/50 split.

Mr. Blain noted that he is not saying that they will come back with an offer to only pay one year's bill but they have to come back with something legitimate. Mr. Seeds noted that he would be in favor of exoneration for half of it. He noted that it was equally responsibility. He suggested that someone messed up; they should have paid and we should have collected.

Mr. Eby questioned if she lived in the residence. Ms. Cornfield answered yes from the time that she was born until she turned 18. She noted that her brother lived there as well. Mr. Eby noted that as a minor she would not have taken care of the bills. Ms. Cornfield noted that her mom was not aware of the bill issue. She may have thought that it was part of the taxes that she paid.

Mr. Eby noted that there was no sewer connection and questioned Mr. Weaver if he was talking about a tapping fee or permitting the structure. Mr. Weaver noted that the tapping fee is the connection fee and at that time there were no tapping fee rules. He noted that the Authority did not charge anything, maybe \$10.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the people that owned the house now, are they being billed. Mr. Weaver answer that the statement you have in front of you is prorated and it would show the

past due amount plus the current amount. He noted that the current amount was part of the settlement. He noted that any future bill will certainly go to the new property owner.

Ms. Lindsey noted that this is a lesson learned that as we put in new sewer laterals, we will make sure that everyone is paying for their service.

Mr. Weaver questioned if you want to pay GHD and staff to do an analysis for the entire Township. He suggested that the current practice is okay as we have started to do all the mini-basin work, but we can get prices from GHD to analysis the billing data system to the County facilities. He noted that we get their data and we can get pretty close.

Mr. Blain noted that you are telling me that you are not 100% certain that we bill everyone in the Township. Mr. Weaver answered based on prior experience he is pretty sure that we do not and there are probably a few out there. He suggested that there may be five to ten properties that slipped through the cracks over the years. Mr. Weaver noted that he has the structures under the Dauphin County GIS data. He noted that we have the current billing data so the difficulty would be Ken Shoaff, the SEO officer, to figure out who has septic permits for every house. He noted if the property is within 150 feet, as it is not as simple as putting the map together with the houses. Mr. Whittle noted that the other issue would be what addresses are active, an improved property versus an unimproved property. He noted that he could do some general review of the County records with the GIS aerials and the sewer accounts, but it would not be 100% accurate. He noted that buildings have changed and there are old accounts that are not being billed anymore.

Mr. Blain noted that the bottom line is that we are saying that probably 99.9% of all accounts are billed so there maybe five or ten that are out there that we may have this issue to deal with in the future. He questioned if it was similar to the amount for this one at \$10,000, so there could be \$100,000 of accounts that might be back 40 years or it could only be \$20,000. He noted to settle this we are not talking about precedence being that we have a pervasive issue internally with the billing structure but we may have a couple of these and it may be the way to settle an account. Mr. Weaver noted that generally speaking, we don't find accounts that aren't billed. He noted with all the mini-basin work we have found one or two. He noted that the other ones have come up at settlement.

Mr. Hornung questioned how many have you found in the past five years. Mr. Weaver answered that we have only had three or four that are similar to this but the majority of the ones

that get to the \$10,000 range would be people who did not apply for a permit for an extra unit. He noted if they put an apartment on the back of the garage and we don't find out about it. He noted that there have only been two or three in the past five years that are similar to the one we are discussing.

Ms. Lindsey questioned that the people that you are finding as you are doing the mini-basin work that having been paying, are they paying off their amount. Mr. Weaver noted that it is collected at settlement. He noted that they have paid in the past.

Mr. Seeds requested a roll call vote: Mr. Eby, aye; Ms. Lindsey, aye; Mr. Blain, aye; Mr. Crissman, nay; Mr. Hornung, aye; Mr. Hawk, aye; and Mr. Seeds, nay.

Mr. Eby questioned since we are tabling this to a future date if there a way that we can have a resolution for when these issues come up that staff or the solicitor can take care of it. Mr. Hornung noted that staff can do the billing but for the Authority to negotiate a lower price it would have to come before the Board for every case. Mr. Eby questioned if they would have a chance to appeal. Mr. Hornung noted that they always have a right to an appeal. Mr. Eby questioned if there was a way to streamline this.

Mr. Weaver noted that the only time staff has brought these to the Board is when someone writes a letter or comes to a meeting, then it is put on the agenda. Mr. Weaver noted that it was on the agenda because the members of the trustee wanted it to be heard as well.

TOWNSHIP REPORTS

Review of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental (DEP) Protection Annual Meeting Presentation

Mr. Weaver explained that staff made this Power Point Presentation to DEP at its annual meeting. He noted that he would go over the first couple of slides and then he would turn it over to Mr. Whittle.

Mr. Weaver noted that the 2nd Amendment of the 2nd Consent Decree was signed by DEP on August 21, 2013 and entered into record by Commonwealth Court on September 18, 2013. He noted that it required GHD to prepared an Act 537 Plan Update to incorporate the 2011 Beaver Creek Corrective Action Plan and the Township's Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors approved the Plan Update on November 6, 2013 and December 9, 2013 respectively. Following a 30-day public comment period, DEP approved the Act 537 Plan Update for the

Beaver Creek Basin on January 30, 2014. He noted that as part of the Decree staff must attend an annual meeting where it presents its annual report to DEP. He noted in order to streamline the meeting staff prepares a power point presentation. He noted that this is the same report that is presented at the annual meeting.

Mr. Weaver noted for the BC CAP Phase 1 - Mini-Basin Replacement/Rehabilitation Projects Construction Phase: He noted that the replacement of all ACP sanitary sewers in BC-1A is now complete. The sanitary sewer replacement project in BC-6A/B/C continued throughout the past year. The portion of BC-6B that is located north of U.S. Route 22 is being replaced as part of the PC-5D/5E project, which is currently under construction. Construction to be completed in 2014.

Mr. Weaver noted that the BC CAP Phase 1 - Mini-Basin Replacement/Rehabilitation Projects Design / Permitting / Bid Phase: He noted that final design, permitting, and easement-related activities were completed for the BC-3A sanitary sewer replacement project. In February 2014, it was determined that mini-basin BC-3B should be included as part of this project. The contract documents for the BC-3A/3B project are being bid tomorrow and the project advertised construction to start late 2014.

Mr. Weaver noted that design, permitting, and easement-related activities associated with the BC-4A/B/C sanitary sewer replacement project took place during the report period and is scheduled for advertisement late 2014 or early 2015.

Mr. Weaver noted that design, permitting, and easement-related activities associated with replacement of Trunk G through the proposed Shadebrook development and the Springford Village Wet Weather Treatment Plant Decommissioning took place during the report period. He noted that bids were opened on August 13th and awarded to M. F. Ronca and Sons., on August 19, 2014, with construction to be completed by December 2014.

Mr. Weaver noted that the following chart shows the excess peak EDU that have been removed as part of the process. He noted that at the far right, with the current CAP on schedule to be done by June 2017, we project to remove 11.12 million gallons per day. He noted that the projects are on schedule and they should be done six months to a year ahead of schedule.

**BC CAP Phase 1 –
Mini-Basin Replacement/Rehabilitation Projects**

Basin	2014 EDUs	Est. ACP/VPC Mainline (ft.)	Est. "Other" Mainline (ft.)	Compara- tive Peak (gpd/EDU)	Est. Peak Excess I/I (mgd)
BC1A	15	8,501	1,831	3,500	0.38
BC3A	28	12,868	5,025	3,100	0.60
BC3B	88	6,040	1,049	7,800	0.60
BC4A	16	8,667	8,806	4,400	0.56
BC4B	54	3,182	4,275	6,000	2.75
BC4C	24	6,928	599	15,000	3.40
BC6A	28	6,473	1,313	2,600	0.45
BC6B	34	16,750	6,285	4,800	1.30
BC6C	18	10,017	14	7,000	1.09
Total	2,28	79,426	29,197		11.12

Mr. Weaver displayed a slide that showed the geographic locations for the BC CAP 1 Mini Basin projects.

Mr. Weaver noted as part of the BC 4 Project he proposed that DEP and Swatara consider allowing the Authority to accumulate permits in order to abandon the Gateway Pumping Station. He noted that the Gateway Corporate Center was initially proposed to go to Beaver Creek but due to the overload problem at the time of construction, the developers were forced to provide a new planning module to construct a pumping station that the Authority would own and operate. He noted that it was approved and it was re-designated to Paxton Creek and not Beaver Creek. He noted that the Authority had a CAP recently approved and it is aggressively doing the projects and he projects that it will remove \$11.2 million gallons of peak I&I. He noted that Gateway only

has 33 EDU's in flow and would not be a detriment to the Swatara System. He noted that he has used the presumption of flow method and it has allowed the Authority to get permits in 2014 so until they get flow data from BC6 he will not contact Swatara or DEP again to request this formally. He noted that it would not be fair that after removing the Springford Plant to remove another area without having real data to show DEP. He noted that the hoped to have BC6 data available after a wet weather event in the spring of 2015 or winter of 2014.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it is still a functional pump station. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if we had plans to do away with it. Mr. Weaver answered that yes, he noted that it was in his mind to be temporary once the Beaver Creek System was corrected and the overload was removed. He noted that it is easy to eliminate as the sewer is already there as it is connected to the pump station; staff would just have to pull the plug on it.

Mr. Seeds questioned why we were not doing that. Mr. Weaver answered that we don't have permission to do it as the Authority had to get a plan approved by DEP and permission from Swatara Township Authority. He noted that it is not in that drainage area as it is in the Paxton Creek drainage area. He noted that they will be amenable to that once staff shows some reductions, so it will eliminate a pump station. Mr. Seeds noted that it is always good to eliminate pump stations if you can.

Mr. Weaver noted that DEP received a phone call in regards to the Wilshire Road On-lot systems asking when sewer would be made available to the residents of Wilshire Road for specifically one or two people. He noted that DEP requested that staff and Lower Paxton Township be prepared to discuss this issue at the Annual Meeting. He noted that staff did some research that was very lengthy. He noted that he has a lot of data to share with the Board and he will be making some recommendations to the Board to seek guidance on this issue.

Mr. Weaver explained that this area was undeveloped and a plan was submitted for Wilshire Estates; the developer was willing to share in a temporary pump station to service the 12 lots that currently are not hooked to the sewer. He noted that Wilshire Estates would have three to six lots hooked to the pump station. He noted that the Authority would have 12 lots and Wilshire would have six lots and it would be split on that pro-rated share basis. He noted that the sewer is already in the street, a dry sewer that is unique. He noted that the Township Manager contacted the old Sewer Authority Manager back in 1989 and explained that the Township was building a street for the residents, and it would be a good idea to put the dry sewer system in. He noted that it may not have been a good idea as there was no sewer planning done, and they just put in dry sewer and did a cost analysis that was not accurate and he would not recommend that the authority accept it. He noted that there is some correspondence from the Authority Manager to the residents that the costs were established on a front foot basis. He noted when he asked Mr. Stine what that would mean to this Board... Mr. Stine noted that he stated that it would not apply at all as it would be what the amount is when they actually connect not when it was done 30 years ago.

Mr. Weaver noted that there are additional costs that will be incurred by the Authority with the dry sewer costs that are included in the minutes, information that he would provide again at a later date. He noted that GHD will have to finalize the current costs with the developer when it is put in, he suggested that it would be between \$250,000 to \$300,000. He noted that the residents would be looking at a significant cost to connect, between \$20,000 to \$40,000. He noted that he provided this information to DEP to give the history and that staff did not feel any need to accelerate the plan. He noted that DEP requested that we consider that but staff had Mr. Shoaff, the on-lot system officer look at the property, and in his opinion, there was no malfunctioning systems in the street that required public sewer emergency. He noted that most of this has been

precipitated by a homeowner that can't get a proper certification to sell his house but the SEO has not labeled the system as malfunctioning.

Mr. Weaver noted that after we completed the presentation, DEP thanked the Authority and said that they would be in contact with the property owner and he has not heard anything since.

Ms. Lindsey noted that a resident from Wilshire contacted her and she said that ten years ago, each resident gave the Township \$2,500 that was supposed to be put in escrow in the event sewer ever came to their development. Mr. Weaver answered that he researched the minutes and the only thing that was noted in the minutes was that Mr. Torak asked the Board if they were interested in doing the dry sewer line, and if so, if he could have authorization with Rogele who was the contractor at the time to engineer the cost. He noted after that he said that everyone was fine with doing it and he would get agreements, have them recorded but there was nothing in the minutes from that point forward. He noted that he has no records.

Mr. Blain noted that Ms. Lindsey mentioned that this was done ten years ago. He noted that he does not remember anything like that being done. He questioned if the caller could show a cancelled check for that as he does not remember that. Mr. Seeds noted that he did not remember that either. He noted that there was discussion on this over the years and he recalled that the Authority staff or GHD discovered that the dry sewer pipes were flat with no elevation and not installed properly. He noted that he also recalled some discussion about a possible pump station. Mr. Weaver noted that the dry sewer could not be connected to anything because there were no sewers in the area and Wilshire Estates could provide sewer connections, but it could not be done by gravity as they would have to cut across a slope and the sewer would have to be 30 feet deep. He noted that the Authority did not want to own a sewer that deep and the developer did not want to put it in. He explained that he could not request the developer to do that for the Authority.

Mr. Shannon suggested that Mr. Seeds is talking about the sewers for Phase I for Wilshire Estates that were installed, some of the lines were laid too flat and the Authority accepted an escrow to maintain in perpetuity any issues that might arise from a flat sewer. He noted that the yellow sewers shown on the map are Wilshire Estate Phase Two sewers that have not been built and that is what the pumping station was supposed to be part of. He noted that the green sewers are the ones that go into Royal Avenue and that area.

Mr. Seeds questioned who the Authority accepted money from. Mr. Shannon answered that it was from the developer, Wilshire Estates. He noted that in lieu of making them dig up the sewer lines an escrow was provided. Mr. Weaver noted that the dry sewer was air tested by staff and it is okay so it can be salvaged from 1989. He noted that it still works and can work if it is connected. He noted that he wanted to present information to the Board due to DEP's inquiry noting that five to ten years from now, when the project moves forward, he wanted the Board to know what is going on and to secure the Board's recommendations for how to proceed.

Mr. Whittle noted that GHD continues to collect flow data from the basins and for the Beaver Creek I/I Metering Program, the continued flow monitoring, data collection and analysis is prioritized, noting that the majority of the mini-basins have been prioritized, leaving only seven (7) remaining mini-basins for prioritizing over the next season. He noted that there has been successful measurement of 100% reduction of excess I/I in BC-1 and staff is in the transition to Sub-Basin grouping and metering for success as a result of improved project management, cost savings, paving management, and flow metering capabilities.

Mr. Whittle noted for the Beaver Creek Hydraulic Modeling, the Township is permitted to have surcharges as long as it can show and demonstrate through hydraulic modeling that those surcharging will not result in overflows. He noted that the Authority has developed a verified hydraulic model that covers all of the existing interceptor's tributary to and including the

Nyes Road and Beaver Creek Interceptors. He noted that two stretches of the interceptor require some additional field investigations to determine if physical reasons exist to account for the capacity difference from the modelled expectations.

Mr. Whittle noted that the Corrective Actions – Group I Mini-Basins, the PC-2C/2D sanitary sewer replacement project was completed this period. He noted that construction activities for the PC-1G/H project continued throughout this report period and will be completed in 2014. He noted that the contract was awarded for the PC-1GDA/1GDB sanitary sewer replacement/rehabilitation project and construction started in March 2014. He noted that design, permitting, and easement related activities were completed; bids were received; and a contract was awarded for the PC-5D/5E sanitary sewer replacement project. Construction started in March 2014 and should be completed in 2014. He noted that a design survey was performed and preliminary design and permitting activities are underway for the PC-4C/4E sanitary sewer replacement project, and a televising and testing contract was prepared for several PVC neighborhoods in Group 1 Paxton Creek mini-basins including PC-1A, PC-3C, PC-1I, PC-4C and PC-4E.

Mr. Whittle noted that Additional Corrective Actions include the construction of the PC-1G/H Interceptor Replacement project that was completed this period and construction underway for Oakhurst Interceptor Extension project will be completed by September. He noted that it is completed on the Susquehanna Township side.

Mr. Whittle noted that we are well ahead of schedule for some of the 2017 and 2022 projects. He noted that the current process has been to prioritize every single mini-basin in the Township and hit the ones with the worst flows. He noted that they are scattered all over the basin map.

Mr. Whittle noted in terms of the Paxton Creek I/I Metering Program for PC-1A and PC-6C still demonstrate a significant amount of remaining I/I after rehabilitation of the majority of the basins. These results have been substantiated by identification of several sources in follow-up field investigations. He noted that PC-1G and PC-1H show a reduction of 75% of excess I/I from initial results following the completion of the majority of work in the basin and it will be followed up with further monitoring after final completion. He noted that PC-2D was successfully metered to demonstrate a 100% reduction of excess I/I, and PC-4B show a reduction of 82% of

excess I/I from initial results; however, this is a difficult basin to meter given the number of influent basins. He noted that some of the basins have multiple meters and each meter has an inherent error to it so although it only shows an 82% reduction in flow, since there are four meters, it may be slightly elevated. He noted that they see a pattern where the flow is consistent no matter the size of the storm event so he is somewhat confident that the flows maybe lower and it may just be hard to measure when you get to that low a level. He noted that the consistent results over both small and large WWEs may indicate that the flows from this basin have been reduced further than indicated by the basin calculations. He noted that the transition to Sub-Basin grouping and metering for success as a result of improved project management, cost savings, paving management, and flow metering capabilities.

Mr. Eby questioned for PC-1A and PC-6C if there has been an identification of the remaining I&I. Mr. Whittle noted that it is very minimum as those basins were very high to begin with and they had overflows in those areas and it was very difficult to measure. He noted that they are showing that there is an extreme level of I&I in those, well above what would be considered a rehab basin so there is additional work to be done. He noted for PC-1A, we only replaced a portion of the basin, as there was some PVC areas that were not addressed and some interceptors that were not addressed so they are trying to identify those areas that may be coming from under slab issues.

Mr. Eby questioned if there have been inspections of private residences concerning their own water runoff potentially leading to under slab. Mr. Whittle answered that the properties that were in the construction area were replaced to the house so there is the possibility of under slab issues or illegal connections that have been reconnected. He noted during wet weather conditions, we have observation T's for each property, and staff can investigate during these events to see where the flow is originating from.

Mr. Eby questioned if it is an under slab from a private residence that are not draining away from the house or are there no resources for the people to know the correct way to connect the downspouts, or to create a rain garden or the use of a rain barrel. Mr. Whittle answered that these houses were inspected as part of the project as well.

Mr. Weaver noted that he would like to provide a quick history for how he addresses under slab issues. He noted after every mini-basin is complete, staff does post flow watering metering and if we don't achieve 90 to 100% then we go back in during wet weather events to

look for sources of underslab. He noted that it is a large staff effort and we are behind schedule on that part of it because we are concentrating on removing the peak I&I that we have remaining. He noted that we are ahead of schedule as we showed today for the DEP schedule for Beaver Creek and Paxton Creek; however we are behind schedule for finding the under slab sources where we have not gotten 90% removal. He noted that we do not have enough information to provide to the Board on underslab issues.

Mr. Whittle noted for the Spring Creek basin the Corrective Actions for the SC-1E and SC-1G Trunk sanitary sewer replacement/rehabilitation project was completed during this report period. He noted for the Spring Creek I/I Metering Program, SC-1E was successfully metered to demonstrate a 92% reduction of excess I/I.

Mr. Whittle noted for Wet Weather Events, there were a number as it was a very wet years. He noted that the Authority had an excused event in October 2013 and there was the excessive snow melt that occurred in February 2014. He noted that there have been more significant wet weather events than historically since we started the process and it has been good for metering but bad for I&I. He noted that we continue to increase the level of the event that requires to impact the sewers, and the work that we are doing is having a very beneficial result. He noted that historically it would only take a certain large event to cause overflows and impact the system but the lines on the map show that they continue to increase as the Authority does more and more work. He noted for Paxton Creek we have reduced almost 90% of the historic overflow locations. He noted that the overwhelming proof of the successfulness of Lower Paxton's I/I removal program is the elimination of overflows in the Paxton Creek and Spring Creek Basins as overflows in these basins have been significantly reduced since engaging in the Mini-basin Rehabilitation Plan. In these two basins there has been an 89% reduction in sanitary sewer overflow locations since the beginning of the CAP, and during this past season, arguably one of the wettest seasons on record, there were only 3 locations still identified as experiencing overflows. He explained that he indicated to DEP that this shows how successful the program has been.

Mr. Weaver noted that the proposed 2014-2015 Community Environmental Project (CEP) entails stream cleaning on a portion of Spring Creek extending from Dowhower Road adjacent to Kohl Memorial Park. He noted that the goal of the project is to improve water quality by improved local flow conveyance, enhanced stream bank stability, reducing soil erosion and

flooding. He noted that the project will cost \$16,750, beginning in November 2014, to be completed by March 2015. He noted that this project was approved by DEP.

Mr. Weaver noted that he received a phone call from Mary Bebenek, who is the South Central Regional Manager and she asked that the Authority consider meeting with the Capital Region Water (CRW), the former Harrisburg City Authority, to consider an integrated approach to solving the Paxton Creek Watershed problems. He noted that he found out later that the EPA requires this as part of the settlement and the Justice Department is also working with CRW to solve some of the Paxton Creek Watershed issues. He noted that the meeting was very beneficial and he was pleased that some of the topics that were discussed, noting that things have changed dramatically for CRW and Swatara Township Authority since when he first started working at Lower Paxton 18 years ago. He noted that the CRW has a great management team and engineer and they are very cooperative and there is no reason why we shouldn't be able to put some things on the table for them to look at. He noted that it remains to be seen if it will be cost effective for the Township but it was only a kickoff meeting. He noted that he anticipates continued meetings with CRW. He noted that CRW is gathering data and rerunning the model and after they do that we will look at plugging in different solutions.

Mr. Weaver noted that he had exciting news as he showed the slide provided to the Authority by GHD that shows that we are far enough along that we can start completing sub-basins to get good data back on sub-basin metering. He noted that his initial thought was the best way to tackle the projects was to do it by sub-basin to do good metering and get the entire neighborhood done as it would be much better for the community. He noted that he did not get support from DEP or the solicitor because they wanted that peak I&I removed and our engineer agreed that the best approach at that time was to jump all over the Township to get rid of the high peak flows. He noted that hindsight being 20/20 it was probably the right way to go at that time because it takes a big storm for us to have an overflow now.

Mr. Weaver noted that now we are so far along, he has the support from GHD and DEP to start doing projects by sub-basins. He noted that he asked GHD to make a recommendation that will be provided in the near future for restructuring the Paxton and Beaver Creeks programs to start doing sub-basins at a time. He noted that the map shows that he will have five complete sub-basins in the next two years and within three years he should have data from five sub-basins.

He noted that he is confident on the sub-basin level as it is repeatable unlike the min-basin data that fluctuates a lot with metering that does not always work.

Mr. Whittle noted that one of the issues that he has with one of the mini-basins that the flow meters determine where there is high flows but the sensors itself that sit in the pipe is $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch thick so when the flows get low enough that they are below an inch the sensor becomes an impediment to the flow and it becomes very difficult to measure low flows in the sewers. He noted that we are getting 100% removal of I&I, it is too low to register on the sensors, and anything coming down the pipe can pump it and make the reading eradicate. He explained by going to a sub-basin, we have more input and measuring more flows with a big difference having a significant amount to measure the low flows and to see the difference between the highs and lows.

Mr. Shannon noted that the first three major projects in Beaver Creek are all sub-basin projects, BC6 which is just finishing up, BC3 which will have a bid opening tomorrow and BC4 which is complete, and so we will be able to get sub-basin data quicker in Beaver Creek. He noted that it is not always possible to do that because some of the sub-basins are very large and disjointed but these lend themselves to that.

Mr. Whittle noted that the first map showed the basins that were already in progress that were being bid currently and should be done quickly while the second map represents for where we will go next. He noted that the second map would be more of a sub-basin approach. Mr. Weaver noted that it would provide a lot of data to help determine future storage needs that we will need.

Grinder Unit Update

Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority had eight different grinder pumps and in the last project staff received permission from the property owners at Coventry and Devonshire Roads to remove their grinder pumps, noting that three of the eight will be removed in the next few weeks, and a fourth one, the Valley Road grinder pump for the Beaufort Manor Apartments, will be removed within the next few months. He noted that there is nothing the Board has to do as the agreement states that once the overload is reduced that the Authority will remove the grinder unit.

Mr. Seeds noted that some will be turned over to the property owners. Mr. Weaver answered that we discussed that with the Board and so far all four have elected to have them removed. He noted that there are a few on Hartman Drive and one in Arlington Avenue. He noted that interceptor is part of PC 4&3 and there is a lot of work to be done in that location.

Delinquent Sewer Account Update

Mr. Weaver noted that the report speaks for itself and he is available to answer any questions you may have on the memo that he provided.

Mr. Seeds noted that we had to divulge this to the news. Mr. Weaver answered that the Authority had to divulge the delinquent list to The Patriot-News under the Right-To-Know Law, and in light of all the comments that he reviewed on Penn Live it did not seem to be very negative.

Mr. Blain noted for the delinquent accounts, is Modern Recovery negotiating collections to get the bill paid. Mr. Weaver answered for the water shutoffs, they demand full payment or a very accelerated payment process. He noted that they will accept longer term payments for people who do not have public water and are on a well. He noted that he will have a second report for the Board at the next meeting as staff has been preparing a policy to collect delinquents for people who have wells. He noted that Modern Recovery requested the Authority to do this. He noted that 25% of the Township does not have public water but he does not know what percentage of the people on the list are those who have wells. He stated that he will get the information for him.

Mr. Blain noted that many times billing agencies will call and hound a person to get collection and once they have you on the phone, they will work with you to pay a smaller amount and marked it as paid. He questioned if Modern Recovery is doing that. Mr. Weaver answered that they do what is called skip tracing and they will figure out what kind of credit the person has so if someone has good credit and they can pay it off they won't accept any payment plan. He noted if they don't have good credit then they will accept a payment plan for a longer period of time. Mr. Blain wanted to know if they compromise the amount. Mr. Weaver answered that Solicitor Stine has told him that he does not have the authority to do that so they must collect 100%.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how staff comes up with the water shut off list from all those names that appeared on the delinquent list. Mr. Weaver answered that the water shut off list is

for people who have not paid in full or have not made a payment plan. He noted that we have shut off the water. Ms. Lindsey questioned if they try to pay their bills. Mr. Weaver noted that he is not sure but he thinks that two of the six that we shutoff are vacant, and he would have to check into the other four homes. He noted that staff is trying to get back to the 2009 delinquency rate.

Mr. Eby noted if they are delinquent and we are doing work on their lateral, is there any course of action that is going to be done. Mr. Weaver noted that it is a very good question and the Authority does not have a policy to correspond with delinquent accounts and the zero cost replacement resolution. He noted that there is no crossover there but he could look into it. Mr. Whittle noted if we chose to do that, we may not be able to maintain the schedule for work, noting that the resident could do it on their own. He noted that the Authority is doing the private laterals. Mr. Seeds noted that it would cost more money to come back to do one home later and not when all the other homes are done.

Mr. Eby questioned if there is a general estimate for what it costs to do a private lateral, noting that there are different depths. Mr. Hilson noted that generally, building sewers from a six inch clean out from the house, the numbers are generally around \$3,500. He noted that most companies charge between \$5,000 and \$7,000 to do the similar work. He noted that it is part of a lump sum that is in the contract.

ENGINEER'S REPORT

Mr. Shannon noted that most of the items in the Engineer's Report have been discussed earlier and he would open it up to any questions.

Mr. Seeds noted in Section 2.9 – Beaver Creek Pumping Station, we were going to keep the big pump, but now we are going to get rid of it. Mr. Shannon explained that there were some problems during the last storm with the controls. He noted in doing the controls, the consensus was to put three pumps in that are all the same size and it will simplify the entire operation. Mr. Weaver noted that this was all staff's issue and he asked Mr. Hilson to look at it and he came up with a solution and met with GHD. He noted that we stalled this move because staff thought that he could get more time out of the big pump, but the controls failed again and we can't take that liability so we have to move ahead and replace the controls and the pump.

Mr. Seeds questioned for Section 5.5, the Charles Barnsley Planning Module next to the Beaver Creek, where does his flow go to. Mr. Hilson answered that he is in an on-lot system. He noted that it is suspected that the system is malfunctioning. Mr. Seeds questioned if it is going to West Hanover Township. Mr. Weaver noted that it is proposed to connect to the Township system and then he will be paying the Authority. Mr. Hilson noted that it would be coming to the Beaver Creek Pump Station.

Mr. Seeds questioned for Section 7.3 if Mr. Weaver needed the Board's approval to meet with Mr. DiSanto and Susquehanna Township about the storage. He suggested that it was provided at the last meeting. Mr. Shannon answered that the Board did but the last time Mr. Wendle recommended that we meet with Susquehanna Authority separately and with Mr. DiSanto, CRW and DEP separately. He noted that they have only had one of those meetings to date. He noted that staff has met with CRW and DEP and Susquehanna Township all together but we did not meet with Susquehanna Township individually as Mr. Wendle suggested. He noted that they have not met with Mr. DiSanto as well. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Shannon is recommending to do this. Mr. Shannon stated that he did not think that Mr. Wendle's recommendation has changed unless the Board would rather we not meet. Mr. Hornung stated that he does not see any purpose with staff meeting with Mr. DiSanto. He suggested that the entire solution is so problematic and political and the chances of success are very slim. He noted unless you can convince me otherwise he would not do it. Mr. Seeds noted that the Board has agreed not to meet with Mr. DiSanto.

Mr. Seeds questioned what about a meeting with Susquehanna Township. Mr. Weaver noted that he has not met with Susquehanna Township yet. He noted that he met with DEP and Harrisburg first because DEP called and asked him to do so. He noted that he will schedule that meeting. Mr. Seeds noted that it is the consensus of the Board to have Mr. Weaver and Mr. Wendle meet with Susquehanna Township.

Mr. Eby noted in regards to the decommissioning of the package plant, he questioned if staff had an estimate for what the project should be. Mr. Shannon noted that the Springfield Village decommissioning treatment plant and the Truck G were put together and the low bid was \$537,000. He noted that his estimate was higher than that. Mr. Weaver noted that their estimate was based on using the current bid numbers for the last few jobs that we had but consistently the

engineer's estimate was very close but the contractors have consistently gone under them. He noted that he is really encouraged with the last few bids that were received.

Mr. John Trish, 600 Prince Street wanted to know why M. F. Ronca and Sons got a change order in the amount of \$1,254,000. He noted that Mr. Weaver did not explain this earlier in the meeting. He noted that Mr. Hornung, at a prior meeting, explained why one change order was for \$72,000 and the next one was a change order for \$1,254,000. He noted if this is for the jobs where the road collapsed, and you had to take that fill out and bring it back since they weren't using the barriers for the road to hold the side of the ditch up; where it barriers were parked at the church and the guys were still working. He noted that he spoke with the guy from the Township and the only thing that upsets him is that maybe everyone thinks that everyone that is elected is doing a great job but when you have a change order for \$1,254,000 and he heard that it would be explained at the next meeting why that change order was so high.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Hilson who manages the construction jobs, provided a memo to the Finance Department to pay Mr. Ronca as part of the change order, noting that the first part was not part of the \$1,254,000 but was additional work on PennDOT projects and that it was more cost effective for the Authority to do with Ronca since they were already mobilized. He noted that it was a significant change order. He noted that the most recent \$1,254,000 change order is part of the pavement restoration that was originally estimated by the engineer. He noted that it was due to the lack of structural integrity of the existing road and also on PennDOT roads where the paving sections were much thicker than anticipated. He noted that the projects are sewer but they are very expensive in terms of paving because the existing roads that the Township has were not built to today's standards. He noted when you replace sewers the roads just fall apart. He noted that there are no roads in the Township that we are working on that are new as the new roads have new sewers in them.

Mr. Trish noted that he understands that but his question is are the roads that you are talking about on Earl Drive. Mr. Weaver answered no as it is not part of this project. He noted that it would be all the roads that are west of Mountain Road and part of Mountain Road. Mr. Trish noted if you go past Mr. Hornung's store and turn left. Mr. Weaver noted that Lockwillow Avenue intercepts with Earl but if you continue on Lockwillow it goes to Mountain Road. Mr. Trish noted that there is a church, he noted that road that goes down there... Mr. Weaver noted that it is Lockwillow Avenue that goes to Mr. Hornung's store... Mr. Trish asked if that is part of

what the additional costs were for. Mr. Weaver answered not for Earl Drive. He noted that it would be Lockwillow Avenue, Mountain Road and all the streets that are west of Mountain Road and Earl is not one of those. He noted that it was part of a project that was done three years ago.

Mr. Trish wanted to know if the church is on the street that is a part of this project. Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Trish what the name of the church was. Mr. Crissman questioned if it is the church off of Mountain Road that sits on the top of the hill. Mr. Hilson question if it is the church on Mountain Road on the northern section beyond the roundabout. Mr. Trish noted that the news reported there was a problem in Lower Paxton that they were doing excavation work and the road imploded. Mr. Weaver answered that was Earl Drive. He noted that it made the news but it was not part of this change order as it was a job that was done a few years ago. Mr. Trish questioned what road is in the area where there is a church adjacent to where they were doing the work.

Mr. Hilson answered that there are two. Mr. Trish noted that he will get the name of the church and the address and when he comes back to the Township and explain it. He noted if they didn't use the barricades to keep the road from crashing in and it crashed in and they had to remove it, when they replaced it they had to replace it and if they faulted on not using the barricades because, at the same time he mentioned that in Shrewsbury they had a gentlemen that was killed because they weren't using the barricades. He noted when he say that they were doing the same work he went over and checked it out and they were not using the barricades as they were all in the parking lot. Mr. Blain noted that he is talking about the shoring that you put in the trenches.

Mr. Hilson noted that this change order is not related to the use of any shore boxes. Mr. Trish noted that the fill would have to be removed and replaced and it should be at the fault of the company not using the shore boxes and we have to pay extra. Mr. Seeds noted that it has nothing to do with that change order.

Mr. Hornung noted that he is curious for what the \$1,254,000 was for. Mr. Weaver noted that it is basically paving as it is very expensive. Mr. Hornung noted that it is due to the paving for the existing roads are not up to spec, but wouldn't you know that. Mr. Hilson answered that the quantities are estimated for the contracts so there are assumptions for how wide the trench would be and how the paving would hold up. He noted for this mini-basin project, when the contractors drove their tri-axles over the road, it disintegrated the pavement. He noted that it fell

apart as we had paving that was tar and chip on top of dirt. Mr. Hornung noted that this would not have been for Mountain Road as we did not do any paving on that road. Mr. Hilson noted for Mountain Road, there were two separate project areas on Mountain Road. He noted for the northern area, the paving section for PennDOT's HOP is required to match the depth of the paving. He noted that their records did not show it to be as deep as we encountered so we were pushing 20 inches of paving. He noted when you have to put that in you have to put lift and lift by lift as you cannot put 20 inches in all at once. He noted that it tripled the quantity of labor and materials for Mountain Road. He noted that \$700,000 of the change order was not depth but width for Township roads since the roads disintegrated. Mr. Hornung questioned what roads were they. Mr. Hilson answered that it was Catherine Street, Mountainview Street, Vera, Fox and many of the roads that connected from Catherine Street going north/south. He noted that we had to replace edge to edge with base as there was no base. Mr. Hornung questioned if you had to dig them up and put a base. Mr. Hilson answered yes and it took a lot of material to do it.

Mr. Weaver noted that we did not want to do it as we wanted the Township to help pay for it.

Mr. Hornung noted that the paving that was done, how much would it cost per foot. Mr. Hilson noted that the base paving is \$40 square yard and was in line with what we normally see. Mr. Hornung questioned if it was what was quoted for the other paving. Mr. Hilson answered that they held that price. He noted that change orders occur for one of two reasons, he noted that one reason is an unforeseen condition or the contractor causes the condition that they should not have and then tries to get paid for it. He noted that is not the cause in this instance, he noted that for this case, there were additional quantities used beyond those that were estimated for the job. He noted for future job estimates, he has increased the width noting that many of the roads are not in good condition before we start the sanitary sewer work. He noted that once a 60,000 pound excavator is moving on these roads and 30 to 40 tri-axles are using the roads per day, they just disintegrate.

Mr. Hornung questioned if it would be better to overestimate instead of having change orders. Mr. Hilson noted that it is tricky because if you overestimate too much, then you could have downsides to that. He noted that you want to get it close within 20%, noting that you don't want to double it. Mr. Hornung questioned what the downside is. Mr. Hilson noted that the contractor would state that they built profit into it and now you are not using any. He noted that

we are now increasing what we are figuring for the base paving, working with GHD noting that we are going with 11 to 13 feet on average. He noted that we do not have a paving history of thickness in the Township and even if we did have information like PennDOT, their information was incorrect.

Mr. Hilson noted that additional pipe was put in the ground and we did more driveway replacement since more of the building sewer happened to be located in the driveways. He noted that those were the big items.

Mr. Seeds questioned if most of the work for the Ronca change order was requested by staff due to more quantities. Mr. Weaver answered that was correct.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT

Mr. Stine noted that he had nothing to report.

Mr. Hornung questioned what about Spring Creek. Mr. Weaver noted that he hopes to be done but the engineer needs to do more analysis around Concord Street. Mr. Hornung questioned if you are about 90% done for Spring Creek.

Mr. Whittle noted that we are well underway for the Paxton Creek basin. Mr. Hornung questioned if it is about 50%. Mr. Whittle noted if you are counting the old style, we are well past that in terms that we have addressed it, maybe 75%.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if we are almost done in Spring Creek. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Ms. Lindsey questioned if they would be doing the area where she lives. Mr. Weaver answered that he has to see how Concord Street goes noting that we are concerned that SC-2 is starting to come up. He noted that we don't have any data for your neighborhood that shows that there are issues.

Mr. Hornung noted that we are just starting Beaver Creek. Mr. Weaver explained that it is a 20-year program with 15 years of replacement and five years of additional work or storage. Mr. Whittle noted that we are well ahead of that program.

Mr. Hornung questioned what the dollars per gallon are. Mr. Weaver answered that he will have that information. Mr. Whittle noted that he will have that information in the near future. Mr. Weaver suggested that it is between \$2.5 and \$3 on average. Mr. Hornung noted that we are over the \$2 level. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle apologized for that as he needed to advise the Board that you have to add inflation to the total. Mr. Shannon noted that as we

eliminate the low hanging fruit it will cost a little more to get a gallon out of the system. He noted that possibly in the next week or so we should have a price for it. Mr. Whittle noted for many of the basins where we have, the data is at the \$1.75 to \$2.75 range. He noted that PC1G/IH, the metering is 80% complete and you are at \$3.90 but we expect to get more flow data in the next season. He noted that many projects are ending at this time of the year.

Mr. Weaver noted that we survived last year doing the work in the area of the Township Municipal Center and Devonshire Road which has more traffic than anywhere in the Township, with 2 million square feet of retail and office space.

Mr. Whittle noted that the one basin that will be high is BC-1A with Linglestown having four separate projects.

Mr. Seeds noted that the next regularly scheduled meeting will be November 25th.

Adjournment

Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung
Authority Secretary